

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/720,393	11/25/2003	Gon Kim	K-0563	4280
34610 KED & ASSO	7590 08/15/2007 CIATES LLP	EXAMINER		
P.O. Box 2212	00	PATEL, RIT	PATEL, RITA RAMESH	
Chantilly, VA 20153-1200			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1746	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/15/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/720,393	KIM ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Rita R. Patel	1746	

	Rita R. Patei	1/40	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the d	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>09 August 2007</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS AF	PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods:	ving replies: (1) an amendment, af tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in	fidavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	ice, which FR 41.31; or (3)
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth	in the final rejection, wh	ichever is later. Ir
no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THI		
TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 70 Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date		136(a) and the energyis	la automaian faa
have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount chortened statutory period for reply orig than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropri	ate extension fee ce action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp	liance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be	filed within two month	s of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any external a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	e appeal. Since
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, i	out prior to the date of filing a brief	will not be entered by	ecause
(a) \(\sigma\) They raise new issues that would require further co			coause
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	•	,,	
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or	ter form for appeal by materially re	ducing or simplifying	the issues for
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally rej	ected claims.	
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1)	16 and 41.33(a)).		
4. \square The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. $igtieq$ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):	See Continuation Sheet.		
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 	•	•	J
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	☑ will not be entered, or b) ☐ wi vided below or appended.	ll be entered and an e	xplanation of
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 6-12 and 16-24.			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	•		
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	t before or on the date of filing a N d sufficient reasons why the affidat	otice of Appeal will <u>no</u> vit or other evidence is	t be entered necessary and
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome all rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fai	ls to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation			
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER		, to botom or allast	
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered bu this request relies on an amendment which has not beer	t does NOT place the application in entered.	n condition for allowar	nce because:
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		•
13. ⊠ Other: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .	1	Ma G	
		MICHAEL BARR	_
	SUPER	/ISORY PATENT EX	AMINER

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 08-06) Continuation of 3. NOTE: The claim amendments filed 8/9/07 present new claim limitations not priorly presented during prosecution and would thus necessitate further consideration and/or search.

Continuation of 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): In response to Applicant's filing of a Terminal Disclaimer on 8/9/07, the provisional rejection of claims 6-8 under obviousness-type double patenting is hereby withdrawn.

Continuation of 13. Other: In response to Applicant's Remarks filed on 8/9/07, Applicant argues that the Ohta reference neither discloses nor suggests that the water level sensor 19 compares a sensed water level to a reference water level, nor that the microprocessor 35 locks or unlocks the cover 2 based on a result of this comparison. However, Ohta does compare a sensed water level (predetermined level) to a reference water level (empty and/or any level below the predetermined level); see pages 5-6 of the Final Office Action filed on 5/16/07. Secondly, in response to Applicant's arguments based on Ohta's failure to teach the microprocessing functions to lock and unlock the cover are based on newly amended claim limitations and thus will not be addressed since these newly submitted amendments will not been entered.